

My amendment is simple. If adopted, it would ensure that the implementation of the Democrat's health care bill shall be conditioned on the Secretary of Health and Human Services certifying to Congress that this legislation would not cause more than 1,000,000 Americans to see higher premiums as compared to projections under current law.

This amendment would ensure that this \$2.5 trillion tax-and-spend bill would not go into effect if the Secretary of Health and Human Services finds that it would actually raise health insurance premiums for more than 1 million Americans compared to projections under current law contrary to the promise made by President Obama that health care reform would result in average savings of \$2,500 per family.

One of the major reasons for enacting health care reform is to ensure that we control rising health care costs that continue to put increasing pressure on American families and small businesses. However, according to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, the premiums under this bill would actually rise for Americans purchasing insurance on their own by as much as 13 percent and will continue to rise at double the rate of inflation for both the small group and large group markets.

Spending \$2.5 trillion of hard-earned taxpayer dollars on a system that already spends almost \$2.2 trillion a year without any impact on controlling health care premiums should be unacceptable to every American.

Madam President, I also wish to speak to my amendment No. 3296 to H.R. 3590, the health care reform legislation. This amendment isn't complicated. It would prevent the provisions of the bill from taking effect in the event that it imposes unfunded mandates on the States. As we all know, this legislation imposes significant new burdens on the States and the proposed funding for this program is, in some cases, likely to fall short. Simply put, the Congress should not impose upon the States new Federal policy requirements without ensuring they are adequately reimbursed. In the event that Congress does not provide full funding for these programs, my amendment would ensure that none of the new mandates will be binding on the States.

MEDICAID PHARMACY REIMBURSEMENT

Mrs. LINCOLN. I would like to engage my colleague, the distinguished Senate Finance Committee chairman, in a short colloquy regarding the Medicaid pharmacy reimbursement provisions in the Senate health care reform bill.

Mr. BAUCUS. I would be happy to engage Senator LINCOLN in a colloquy. I commend her for all her leadership over the years on this issue, because she recognizes that it is important to reimburse pharmacies adequately for the generic medications they dispense to Medicaid patients. In rural States like ours, Medicaid patients need access to their community pharmacies to

obtain their medications. Sometimes community pharmacies are the only health care providers for many miles. So, it is important that we permanently fix in this health care reform bill the problems for pharmacies caused by the severe reimbursement cuts from the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank my colleague and agree with him. That is why I ask him the purpose behind the language in the bill that would establish the Federal upper limit for generics at no less than 175 percent of the weighted-average average manufacturer price. I know this amount is less than the chairman originally proposed in the Medicaid Fair Drug Payment Act from last Congress, which I cosponsored. However, in what cases would it be the intent of the intent of the chairman that the Federal upper limit would be set at more than 175 percent? I am particularly concerned about my small independent pharmacies in Arkansas that fill a significant number of Medicaid prescriptions. Would it be the intent to set a higher rate for these pharmacies? Would it be the intent to set a higher rate for generics that might be in short supply or for which there are availability problems to encourage more manufacturers to make them?

Mr. BAUCUS. I would say to my colleague that the language indicating that the Secretary could set the Federal upper limit at no less than 175 percent the weighted average average manufacturer price could be used in those types of circumstances. It would give the Secretary flexibility to set the Federal upper limits in cases where there is a need to provide states with a higher match in order to assure that appropriate payment is made to pharmacies to encourage the use of generic drugs.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank the chairman for his insights into this provision and his work on behalf of our Nation's community pharmacies.

WISCONSIN'S MEDICAID PROGRAM

Mr. KOHL. Madam President, I rise to discuss language in the Reid substitute amendment to H.R. 3590 that would have a dramatic effect on Wisconsin's Medicaid Program. I would like to converse about this with two of my distinguished colleagues—the other Senator from my home State of Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, and Senator BAUCUS, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

I commend Senator BAUCUS's long and hard work in crafting this historical piece of legislation, and today, I seek clarification of one piece of this bill.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I also seek clarification of this piece of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, specifically in section 2001, regarding the definition of individuals that would be considered newly eligible under Medicaid.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Senator. I would be pleased to enter into a colloquy with the Senators from Wisconsin on this subject.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator. Section 2001 of the legislation describes

which individuals in each State will be deemed "newly eligible" for Medicaid. It is my understanding that the Federal Government will provide 100 percent of the funds to cover this group of newly eligibles from 2014 to 2016 and that States will be provided with their current law FMAP rates, which are below 100 percent, for individuals already covered. Is this correct?

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Senator for the question. Yes, that is correct, and it is my understanding of the legislation as well.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator. As the Senator knows, to be considered "newly eligible" under this bill, individuals must not be eligible under the State plan or under a waiver of the plan for full benefits or for benchmark coverage as described in section 1937 of the Social Security Act. Two of the benefits that must be incorporated into benchmark coverage under section 1937 of the Social Security Act are mental health and substance use disorder services, and prescription drug coverage. If these two benefits are not offered at all, then the coverage will not count as benchmark coverage.

Mr. KOHL. As my two colleagues are aware, Wisconsin currently provides coverage for a number of individuals under a Medicaid waiver, but this coverage does not meet the requirements for benchmark or benchmark-equivalent coverage under the Social Security Act. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Federal agency that oversees Medicaid, has confirmed this for us. Senator FEINGOLD and I understand that, because of this, the individuals in Wisconsin who do not receive benchmark or benchmark-equivalent coverage will be considered newly eligible, and therefore Wisconsin will receive 100 percent Federal funds for those individuals in 2014, 2015, and 2016. Is this the Senator's understanding of the legislation as well?

Mr. BAUCUS. Yes. I thank the Senator.

RELIGIOUS CONSCIENCE EXEMPTION

Mr. CASEY. May I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield for a question about the managers' amendment, amendment 3276, to amendment 2786 to H.R. 3590?

Mr. HARKIN. Of course.

Mr. CASEY. Chairman HARKIN, the managers' amendment includes a religious conscience exemption from the individual requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage in section 1501. Is it the intent of the managers that this exemption apply to an individual who is a member of recognized religious sect described in Internal Revenue Code section 1402(g) regardless of employment status?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, the intent of the religious exemption is to focus on an individual who is a member of a religious